

REMARKS

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

This Amendment and Response (the "Amendment") is submitted in response to the non-final Office Action dated May 2, 2008 (the "Office Action"). Claims 14-27 are pending in the application and claims 1-13 have been canceled in a Preliminary Amendment previously submitted on June 8, 2006 (the "Preliminary Amendment"), without prejudice to their subsequent prosecution in any continuing application or disclaimer of the proprietary rights set forth therein. Claims 14, 20 and 27 are in independent form.

Initially, as outlined above, claims 15-19 and 21-26 have been amended to correct dependency from claims that were canceled in the Preliminary Amendment. Accordingly, examination of these claims is respectfully requested. It is believed that no new matter has been added as a result of the claim amendments.

Additionally, in the second paragraph of the Office Action, the Examiner states that the Information Disclosure Statement file don June 8, 2006, did not include a listing of patents, publications, applications or other information for consideration by the office. In response, the Examiner's attention is respectfully drawn to the Information Disclosure Statement filed on September 16, 2006 where Applicants filed the "Information Disclosure Statement By Applicant" that was inadvertently omitted from the Information Disclosure Statement filed on June 8, 2006.

II. THE CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

In the office Action, claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) ("Section 102(b)") as allegedly being Anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,167,625 to King *et al.* (hereinafter "King"). The rejection is traversed for at least the following reasons.

Claim 20 is directed to a wet shaving system comprising "at least one blade, a platform and a guard bar having two ends and positioned forward of the at least one blade and parallel to the blade cutting edge, *said platform having parts molded over said ends of said guard bar.*" Applicants respectfully submit that King fails to teach or suggest such a wet shaving system.

In the Office Action, the Examiner asserts that the platform in King includes the cap 16, guard 18, seat 20 and spacers 22 and that the skin-contacting element 11 is a guard bar.

The Examiner further asserts that the “platform (16, 18, 20, 22) [has] parts molded over said ends (38) of said guard bar (11)” and cites to column 4, lines 17-19 and Figures 1 and 2 of King in support. *Office Action*, page 2. Applicants respectfully disagree.

King discloses,

[i]n accordance with generally known insert molding processes, the blades 12, 14 are positioned in a cartridge forming mold, and plastic, preferably polypropylene, is injected to form seat 20, cap 16, spacers 22, and guard 18 and, in doing so, secure the blades as shown. The guard 18 is molded so as to form the recess 29 extending across the front surface of guard 18, including a horizontal ledge 36, a vertically extending rear wall 37, and a top ledge 36a, such that the recess 29 is partially inset into the guard 18 as shown in FIG. 2. Insert molding to form razor cartridges per se is generally known and therefore need not be described in detail here. For an example of a suitable insert molding process, see U.S. Pat. No. 5,141,694. *After the cartridge unit has been thus molded, the skin-contacting element 11 is insert molded so as to fill the recess 29.*

King, col. 4, lines 5-19 (emphasis added). Therefore, the platform (16, 18, 20 and 22) in King is molded first and *then, after* the platform is molded, “the skin-contacting element 11 is insert molded so as to fill the recess 29.” Accordingly, King does not teach or suggest a “platform having parts molded over said ends of said guard bar” as claimed in claim 1.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *M.P.E.P.* § 2131 (quoting *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed Cir. 1987)). Accordingly, because, as discussed above, the sections of King relied upon by the Examiner at least do not provide for a “platform having parts molded over said ends of said guard bar,” the Section 102(b) rejections must fail as a matter of law. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 20 and its dependent claims are not anticipated by King and request that the Section 102 rejection be withdrawn.

III. THE CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

In the Office Action, claims 14 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) (“Section 103(a)”) as allegedly being unpatentable over King. The rejections are traversed for at least the following reasons.

A. Claim 14 is Patentable Over King

Claim 14 is directed to a process for the manufacture of a wet shaving system comprising the steps of “providing a guard bar having two ends; positioning said guard bar in a mold cavity for said platform; and molding at least part of the platform by injecting plastic in the mold cavity, *wherein said at least part of the platform is molded over said ends of said guard bar.*” The deficiencies of King are discussed above, namely, because the platform in King is molded first and then, after the platform is molded, “the skin-contacting element 11 is insert molded so as to fill the recess 29,” King fails to teach molding at least part of the platform over the ends of a guard bar. Further, there is also no motivation or suggestion in King for molding at least part of the ends of the platform over the skin-contacting element as the recess 29 is pre-molded into the platform. Accordingly, King fails to teach or suggest “molding at least part of the platform by injecting plastic in the mold cavity, wherein said at least part of the platform is molded over said ends of said guard bar” as claimed in claim 14. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 14 and its dependent claims are not obvious in view of King and request that the Section 103 rejection be withdrawn.

B. Claim 27 is Patentable Over King

Claim 27 is directed to a process for the manufacture of a wet shaving system comprising the steps of:

providing a guard bard having two ends;

positioning said guard bar in a mold cavity for said platform; and

molding at least part of the platform by injecting plastic in the mold cavity, wherein the at least part of the platform is molded over the ends of the guard bar, and

wherein the guard bar includes a longitudinal body having a substantially circular cross-section.

As discussed above, King fails to teach molding at least part of the platform over the ends of a guard bar. Further, as discussed above, there is also no motivation or suggestion in King for molding at least part of the ends of the platform over the guard bar. Accordingly, King fails to teach or suggest a “molding at least part of the platform by injecting plastic in the mold cavity, wherein the at least part of the platform is molded over the ends of the guard

U.S. Application No.: 10/569,304
Docket No.: 11348-021-999
Response to Office Action dated May 2, 2008
Filed August 4, 2008

bar" as claimed in claim 27. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 27 is not obvious in view of King and request that the Section 103 rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION


In view of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider pending claims 14-27 with a view towards allowance.

The Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (212) 326-3939 if a telephone call could help resolve any remaining issues.

Should any fees be required, please charge such fees to Jones Day Deposit Account No. 50-3013.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 4, 2008



Anthony D. Mustillo (Reg. No. 58,836)
JONES DAY
222 East 41st Street
New York, New York 10017
(212) 326-3939